#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D **3 1 AUG 2005** 

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

То:		PCT					
see form PCT/ISA/220		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis.</i> 1)					
		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)					
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION . See paragraph 2 below					
International application No. PCT/US2004/016021	International filing date (c 21.05.2004	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 07.04.2000				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F1/00							
Applicant WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY		4					

1.	This opinion	contains	indications	relating	to	the	following	items:
----	--------------	----------	-------------	----------	----	-----	-----------	--------

$\boxtimes$	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
$\boxtimes$	Box No. II	Priority
$\boxtimes$	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
$\boxtimes$	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
Ø	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

#### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016 **Authorized Officer** 

Segura, G

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4874



### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/016021

	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion
1. 1	With re	egard to the <b>language</b> , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
I	la	nis opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With reneces	egard to any <b>nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence</b> disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
i	a. type	e of material:
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
1	b. forn	nat of material:
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c. time	of filing/furnishing:
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.	ha co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as opropriate, were furnished.
4.	Additio	onal comments:
	Box N	lo. II Priority
1.	de re	the validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority bees not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where equired, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2.	h	his opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim as been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international ing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/016021

	k No. III Non-establishment o dicability	f opi	inion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial			
The obv	e questions whether the claimed ious), or to be industrially applica	inver able l	ntion appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non have not been examined in respect of:			
	the entire international application,					
$\boxtimes$	claims Nos. 24-44					
bec	ause:					
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
	the description, claims or drawi unclear that no meaningful opin		(indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so could be formed (specify):			
	the claims, or said claims Nos. could be formed.	are s	so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion			
$\boxtimes$	no international search report h	as b	een established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 24-44			
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:					
	the written form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleo not comply with the technical re	tide a equir	and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do ements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.			
	See separate sheet for further	detai	ils			

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/016021

	Вох	No. IV	Lack of unity of it	vention					
1.	$\boxtimes$	☑ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:							
			paid additional fees.						
			paid additional fees	under pro	otest.				
		$\boxtimes$	not paid additional fe	es.					
2.		This Ai	uthority found that the olicant to pay addition	e requirer al fees.	nent of uni	ty of invention	on is not complied with and chose not to invite		
3.	This	Author	rity considers that the	requiren	nent of unit	ty of invention	n in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is		
		complie	d with	*					
	⊠ r	not com	plied with for the follo	wing rea	sons:				
		see se	parate sheet		. f'				
4.	Con	sequer	ntly, this report has be	en estab	olished in re	espect of the	following parts of the international application:		
	□ a	all parts							
	⊠t	he part	s relating to claims N	os. 1-23					
	Box	No. V ustrial	Reasoned statem applicability; citatio	ent und	er Rule 43 explanatio	<i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) w ns supporti	vith regard to novelty, inventive step or ng such statement		
1.	Stat	tement							
	Nov	velty (N)	)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	20 1,9			
	Inve	entive s	tep (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1,9,20			
	Indi	ustrial a	applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1,9,20			
2.	Cita	ations a	nd explanations						

see separate sheet

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2004/016021

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-0 887 723 (INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION) 30 December 1998 (1998-12-30)

D2: US-A-5 943 421 (GRABON ET AL) 24 August 1999 (1999-08-24)

D3: EP-A-0 880 088 (MITSUBISHI CORPORATION) 25 November 1998 (1998-11-25)

### Re Item IV Lack of unity of invention

This Authority considers that there are 2 inventions covered by the claims indicated as follows:

I: Claims 1-23 Securing the decryption step.

II: Claims 24-44 Search acceleration.

The reasons for which the inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept, as required by Rule 13.1 PCT, are as follows:

The prior art has been identified as D1. This document discloses a method for securely sharing data with authorized parties, wherein the data to be shared is stored in a database ("external storage device", column 4, line 27) in a first encrypted format ("CSS encrypted original data", column 4, line 36), the method comprising: providing a programmable logic device ("central processing unit", column 4, lines 9-10) for connection to the database, wherein the programmable logic device is configured to receive a stream of encrypted data from the database ("received encrypted", column 4, line 21-22), decrypt the received encrypted data stream to create decrypted data ("descrambling", column 4, lines 20-21), and encrypt the decrypted data in a second encrypted format ("re-encrypted", column 4, lines 37-38); and sharing the data of the second encrypted format by communicating it to an authorized party ("transferred", column 5, lines 6-8).

From the comparison between D1 and the 1st invention (see claim 4), the features which are known from D1 are the following: a memory device in communication with the

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2004/016021

programable logic device ("memory 25", figure 1).

So that the following technical feature of claim 4 can be seen to make a contribution over the same prior art (in the sense of PCT Rule 13.2): the content of the memory device is accessible only by the programmable logic device and the programmable logic device is further configured to store at least a portion of the decrypted data in the memory device. From these Special Technical Features, the technical problem 1 to be solved may therefore be regarded as: how to secure the decryption step.

From the comparison between D1 and the 2nd invention (see claim 24), the features which are known from D1 are the following: a device for processing data received from a mass storage medium ("external storage device", column 4, line 27), the device comprising a programmable logic device ("central processing unit", column 4, lines 9-10) in communication with the mass storage medium comprising compressed data stored therein ("data compressed", column 3, line 24), the programmable logic device being configured to receive continous stream of compressed data from the mass storage medium ("original data arrives", column 4, line 26), and decompress the received compressed data stream to create a stream of decompressed data ("decoding of a clear compressed video/data signal", column 6, lines 12-13).

So that the following technical features of claim 24 can be seen to make a contribution over the same prior art (in the sense of PCT Rule 13.2): perform a search operation within the stream of decompressed data. From these Special Technical Features, the technical problem 2 to be solved may therefore be regarded as: how to perform a high speed search.

The above analysis shows that claimed invention 1 and invention 2 do not have same Special Technical Features as required by PCT Rule 13.2.

Moreover, the technical problems are not the same and therefore the comparison between the claimed inventions does not show any corresponding Special Technical Feature. Therefore there is no technical relationship among the 2 inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. As a result, claimed invention 1 and invention 2 fail to demonstrate a single general inventive concept as required by PCT Rule 13.1.

#### Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1 and 9 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 1.1 The document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A method for securely sharing data with authorized parties, wherein the data to be shared is stored in a database ("external storage device", column 4, line 27) in a first encrypted format ("CSS encrypted original data", column 4, line 36), the method comprising: providing a programmable logic device ("central processing unit", column 4, lines 9-10) for connection to the database, wherein the programmable logic device is configured to receive a stream of encrypted data from the database ("received encrypted", column 4, line 21-22), decrypt the received encrypted data stream to create decrypted data ("descrambling", column 4, lines 20-21), and encrypt the decrypted data in a second encrypted format ("re-encrypted", column 4, lines 37-38); and sharing the data of the second encrypted format by communicating it to an authorized party ("transferred", column 5, lines 6-8).

Hence, document D1 discloses all the technical features of claim 1 and therefore claim 1 lacks novelty.

- 1.2 The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claim 9 (device), which therefore is also considered not new.
- 2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 20 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT, for the following reasons:

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2004/016021

The subject matter of independent claim 20 differs from this known D1 in that it provides a reconfigurable logic device and the second encrypted format is delivered to a requester. Both features are juxtaposed and merely represent design choices so that claim 20 lacks an inventive step.

3. Dependent claims 2-8, 10-19 and 21-23 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, see documents D1-D3 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.